

**FILED**

**JUN 03 2020**

Clerk, U.S. District Court  
District Of Montana  
Great Falls

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA  
GREAT FALLS DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

AMANDA MIKHA CHERI ST.  
MARKS,

Defendant.

CR 15-82-GF-BMM-JTJ

**FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS**

**I. Synopsis**

Defendant Amanda Mikha Cheri St. Marks (St. Marks) has been accused of violating the conditions of her supervised release. St. Marks admitted the alleged violation. St. Marks's supervised release should be revoked. St. Marks should be placed in custody until September 30, 2020, with no supervised release to follow.

**II. Status**

St. Marks pleaded guilty to Bank Employee Fraud on February 8, 2016. (Doc. 37). The Court sentenced St. Marks to 7 days of custody, followed by 3 years of supervised release. (Doc. 60). St. Marks's current term of supervised release began on September 17, 2019. (Doc. 156 at 2).

### **Petition**

The United States Probation Office filed a Petition on December 26, 2019, requesting that the Court revoke St. Marks's supervised release. (Doc. 156). The Petition alleged that St. Marks violated the conditions of her supervised release by failing to notify her probation of a change in residence.

### **Initial appearance**

St. Marks appeared before the undersigned for her initial appearance on June 2, 2020. St. Marks was represented by counsel. St. Marks stated that she had read the petition and that she understood the allegations. St. Marks waived her right to a preliminary hearing. The parties consented to proceed with the revocation hearing before the undersigned.

### **Revocation hearing**

The Court conducted a revocation hearing on June 2, 2020. St. Marks admitted that she had violated the conditions of her supervised release by failing to notify her probation of a change in residence. The violation is serious and warrants revocation of St. Marks's supervised release.

St. Marks's violation is a Grade C violation. St. Marks's criminal history category is I. St. Marks's underlying offense is a Class B felony. St. Marks could be incarcerated for up to 36 months. St. Marks could be ordered to remain on

supervised release for up to 25 months, less any custody time imposed. The United States Sentencing Guidelines call for a term of custody of 3 to 9 months.

### **III. Analysis**

St. Marks's supervised release should be revoked. St. Marks should be incarcerated until September 30, 2020, with no supervised release to follow. This sentence is sufficient but not greater than necessary.

### **IV. Conclusion**

The Court informed St. Marks that the above sentence would be recommended to United States District Judge Brian Morris. The Court also informed St. Marks of her right to object to these Findings and Recommendations within 14 days of their issuance. The Court explained to St. Marks that Judge Morris would consider a timely objection before making a final determination on whether to revoke her supervised release and what, if any, sanction to impose. St. Marks stated that she wished to waive her right to object to these Findings and Recommendations, and that she wished to waive her right to allocute before Judge Morris.

The Court **FINDS:**

Amanda Mikha Cheri St. Marks violated the conditions of her supervised release by failing to notify her probation officer of a change in residence.

The Court **RECOMMENDS:**

That the District Court revoke St. Marks's supervised release and commit her to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons until September 30, 2020, with no supervised release to follow.

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO OBJECT TO FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO OBJECT**

The parties may serve and file written objections to the Findings and Recommendations within 14 days of their entry, as indicated on the Notice of Electronic Filing. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A district court judge will make a de novo determination regarding any portion of the Findings and Recommendations to which objection is made. The district court judge may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the Findings and Recommendations. Failure to timely file written objections may bar a de novo determination by the district court judge, and may waive the right to appear and allocute before a district court judge.

DATED this 3rd day of June, 2020.



John Johnston  
United States Magistrate Judge